



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,516	10/23/2003	Murli Satagopan	MS306229.01/40062.0217US0	2199
7590 06/16/2008				
Homer L. Knearl Merchant & Gould P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER PHAN, TUANKHANH D	
			ART UNIT 2163	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/16/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/693,516

Applicant(s)

SATAGOPAN ET AL.

Examiner

TUAN-KHANH PHAN

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment, filed 3/13/2008, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner. Claims 1-42 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-42 have been considered, but they are not persuasive.

Issue I. The Applicant argues that the combination of Lui and Low does not disclose or suggest receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request for access to document stored on a first computer system; and replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location. Low does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui. Low discloses resolving a name or number string with an IP address using a Domain Name System (DNS) of the Internet. See Low, column 5, lines 35- 42; column 10, lines 62-65; and column 13, line 60 through column 14, line 36; and FIG. 6. The resolution in Low is not implemented by the same computer that implements a user interface that receives the request for access to documents. In contrast, claim 1 requires replacing the user-friendly handle at the second computer system, on which the user interface is implemented.

Response I. The Examiner would like to emphasize that resolving a name or number string with an IP address using a Domain Name System (DNS) or alike of the Internet as disclosed by Low does affect implementation of a user interface that allows

to input the request for access to documents from another computer. The combination of two references of Lui and Low is obvious over the claimed invention. Thus, the Applicant's argument is not persuasive. Other arguments made by the Applicants are similar to the Issue I, so they are also not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-10, 23, 25, 28-30, 32, 34, 35, 37 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui et al. ("Interoperability of Peer-to-Peer File Sharing Protocols", August 2002), hereinafter Lui, and further in view of Low et al. (US Pat. 7,206,304), hereinafter Low.

Regarding **claims 1 and 7**, Lui discloses a file sharing method stored on a computer system peer one through a computer system peer two connected in a network environment (p. 25, ¶ 2; Figure 4; p. 29, ¶ 2) comprising:

storing at the second computer system an identity information file from the first peer, the said identity information file comprising a set of interfaces identifying a principal and machine location of the first peer system (p. 29, ¶ 2);

receiving at a user interface implemented on the second computer system the request for access to documents stored on the first computer system and intercepting at

the second computer system a request for access to document files when the request is directed to the user interface (p. 33, ¶ 1);

sending request for access to document files to the machine location of the first peer system (Figure 4; p. 29, ¶ 2).

While Lui discloses an interface to accept a user's input for accessing and connecting another in which it is inherent that a user interface is no difference, Lui does not explicitly disclose replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location;

However, in the same field of endeavor, Low discloses replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location (i.e. identifying by a name that can be resolved into the corresponding IP address, wherein the corresponding IP and domain name can have a telephone number (abstract; col. 14, lines 20-55; col. 5, ll. 35-40, col. 10, ll. 35-55. While it is inherent that resolving a name to and IP address always provides a seamless replacement to one of ordinary skill in the art, it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the resolving of an alphanumeric string into IP address for location of a machine taught by Low into the identifying the other location taught by Lui to give an adaptation of name services into IP address in spite of letting the other party see one's IP address, so that retrieving and mapping to the corresponding service resource is a simplicity for the client's side.

Regarding **claim 3**, the method of claim 1 above and Lui further discloses wherein the peer location comprises an IP address to discover other peers (p. 26, ¶ 3).

Regarding **claim 5**, the method of claim 1 above and Lui further discloses wherein the peer location comprises a principal-initiated request (Figure 3; p. 28, ¶ 2).

Regarding **claim 6**, the method of claim 1 and Lui further discloses further comprising an initial step of receiving at the second computer system the identity information document from the first computer (p. 25, ¶ 2; Figure 3; p. 28, ¶ 2).

Regarding claims 9,, Low further teaches the user-friendly handle comprises a telephone number and telephone call (abstract).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 7 above and Lui further discloses wherein the machine location comprises an IP address (p. 26, ¶ 3).

Claims 23, 30, 34 and 35 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 1 and 7 above.

Claims 25, 32, and 37 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above with reference to discussion of claim 1.

Regarding claims 28 and 29, Lui and Low teach a method of claim 23 above receiving identity and right to access documents from a first user in a networking environment (abstract).

Regarding **claim 42**, Low further teaches wherein authentication server comprises more than one machine location for principal identified by the user friendly interface (Fig. 14.).

Claims 4, 11-15, 17-22, 26-27, 33-34, 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Low, and further in view of Boyle et al. (US Pat. 5,782,847).

Regarding claims 4 and 11-12, Lui and Low teach a method of claims 1 and 7 above but lack wherein the machine location comprises a public key to determine current machine location. However, in the same field of endeavor, Boyle et al. teach the machine location comprises a public key to determine current machine location (col. 8, lines 50-61; col. 26, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the public key taught by Boyle et al. into the disclosure of Lui and Low to enhance security feature so that authentication of involved parties is measured.

Regarding **claims 13 and 26-27**, the method of claim 11 above, Boy et al. further teaches wherein a Secure DNS server having an encrypted machine name and location (Col. 2, lines 9-13, Col. 8, lines 50-61); converting the public key to the encrypted machine name and to look up the registered machine location for the publishing node on the SDNS (Col. 22); sending the request to access to documents (Col. 20, lines, 2-57).

Regarding **claim 14**, Lui and Low teach the method of claim 7 but lack comprises verifying the authorization of the accessing node to review the requested documents before utilizing the requested documents. However, in the same field of endeavor, Boy et al. teach verifying the authorization of the accessing node to review the requested documents before utilizing the requested documents (abstract; Col. 20, lines 10-60; Col.

5, lines 13-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the verifying the authorization taught by Boyle et al. into the disclosure of Lui and Low above to, again, enhance security feature so that authentication of involved parties is measured.

Regarding **claim 15**, see discussion of claim 13 above.

Regarding **claims 17-18**, Boyle et al. further teach a method of claim 15 wherein delivering a path location to a principal of the accessing node (Col. 20, lines 10-60).

Regarding **claims 19 and 22**, Lui and Low teach the method of claim 7 but lack identity information document. However, in the same field of endeavor, Boyle et al. teach the resolving step comprises: receiving the request for access to documents when the request is directed to the user-friendly handle (Col. 4, lines 23-65; Col. 24, lines 29-64); finding a matching identity information document having a user-friendly handle that matches the user-friendly handle in the request (Col. 24, lines 29-64); determining the machine location from the matching identity information document (Col. 24, lines 29-64); and amending the request to substitute the user-friendly handle with the machine location (Col. 6, lines 52-64; Col. 24, lines 29-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the verifying identity information document steps taught by Boyle et al. into the disclosure of Lui and Low above to, verify the exact document intended for the other party so that no mistake in document identity happens.

Regarding claims 20 and 21, see discussion of claim 17 above.

Regarding claims 38-41, Lui and Low teach the process of claim 35 but lack the machine location comprises a public key to determine the publishing node. However, in the same field of endeavor, Boyle et al. teach the machine location comprises a public key to determine current machine location (col. 8, lines 50-61; col. 26, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the public key taught by Boyle et al. into the disclosure of Lui and Low to enhance security feature so that authentication of involved parties is measured.

Claims 2, 8, 16, 24 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Low, and in further view of Huitema et al. (US Patent 7,065,587).

Regarding claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 31, and 36, Lui and Low teach limitations of claims 1, 7, 15, 23, 30, and 35, but lack the user-friendly handle comprising an email address.

Huitema et al. disclose a method of accessing between nodes comprising an email address (Col. 15, lines 50-55). Since the use of email address is well known in the art for embedding in strings of datagrams, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the email address taught by Huitema et al. into the teaching of Boyle et al. to increase the accessibility between machine locations. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time the invention was made to understand TCP/IP protocols and formats, as disclosed by Boyle et al. (abstract), include using email.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TUAN-KHANH PHAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3047. The examiner can normally be reached on 4/5/9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2163

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TKP

/don wong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2163